

Negation in Igálà

Johnson Folorunso ILORI¹
Francis Olugbenga OYEBADE²

Abstract: Unlike other Yoruboid languages, Igálà uses a double negation syntax which combines two independent but mutually obligatory elements to generate a single semantic unit of negation. Apart from providing a description of Igálà negation system, this paper, relying on instruments of minimalist grammar as propounded in Chomsky (1995, 1998, 2002), argues for a negative clause projection in which there are two separate but interdependent Neg projections – NegP1 and NegP2 – such that Neg⁰2 takes NegP1 as complement to project NegP2. Spell-out constituent ordering derives from Neg⁰2 **ń/nóò** attracting NegP1 to Spec-NegP2 resulting in the word order where Neg⁰2 obligatorily ends negative clause expressions in Igálà. This grammar structurally predicts that nothing follows Neg⁰2 **ń/nóò** in the linear order of words in Igálà negative clause constructions.

Keywords: Double negation; Negative concord; Extended Projection Principle (EPP).

Resumo: Diferentemente de outras línguas Yoruboid, Igalá usa uma sintaxe da dupla negação que combina dois elementos independentes, mas mutuamente obrigatórios para gerar uma única unidade semântica de negação. Além de prover uma descrição do sistema de negação do Igalá, esse artigo, apoiado em instrumentos da gramática minimalista, como proposta por Chomsky (1995, 1998, 2002), defende uma projeção da oração negativa em que há duas projeções Neg separadas, mas interdependentes – NegP1 e NegP2 – de tal modo que Neg⁰2 toma NegP1 como complemento para projetar NegP2. A ordenação do constituinte explícito deriva de a Neg⁰2 **ń/nóò** atrair NegP1 para SpecNegP2, resultando numa ordem de palavras em que Neg⁰2 obrigatoriamente fica no final de orações negativas em Igalá. Esta gramática prevê estruturalmente que nada segue Neg⁰2 **ń/nóò** na ordem linear de palavras em construções oracionais negativas em Igalá.

Palavras-chave: Dupla negação; Concordância negativa; Princípio da Projeção Estendida.

Introduction

Negation is a UG property which is parametrically realized cross-linguistically. In some languages, negation is expressed through morphological inflection on verbs. This observation may have been the basis to Stump's (2001 p.28-29) classification of the inherent inflectional categories of verbs to include "... tense, aspect, polarity, voice and (in some uses) mood" where he defines polarity in this context as "... a category of morpho-syntactic properties distinguishing affirmative sentences from negative sentences". There are also languages

¹ Professor PHD in Adekunle Ajasin University. Akungba-Akoko Ondo State, Nigeria. E-mail: jfilori@gmail.com

² Professor PHD in Adekunle Ajasin University. Akungba-Akoko Ondo State, Nigeria. E-mail: foyebade2000@yahoo.com

which express negation by using free (i.e. non-inflectional) negative morphemes. In this other group, there are two major possibilities: (i) languages in which every negative element/morpheme corresponds to a semantic negation, e.g. Yorùbá **(k)ò**, as used in (1b);

- | | |
|--|---|
| (1a) Akín wá
Akin-T come
'Akin came.' | (1b) Akín (k)ò wá
Akin neg come
'Akin did not come.' |
|--|---|

and (ii) languages in which a negative morpheme does not necessarily correspond to a semantic negation but a combination of such elements (at least two) yield one semantic effect of negation, e.g. nie...nie in Afrikaans, as in (2).

- (2) Hy is nie moeg nie
He is NEG tired NEG
'He is not tired.' (BIBERAUER & ZEIJLSTRA, 2009 p.4)

A distinction is often made in respect of languages in (ii) between those languages where each of the negative elements in the combination can independently induce a semantic negation and others where each of the negative elements cannot but must combine clause-internally, i.e. somehow depend on another, such that independent interpretation of semantic negation for each of them is impossible. Languages in the former are referred to as Double Negation (DN), e.g. Dutch, while those in the latter group, e.g. Romanian, Afrikaans, etc. are called Negative Concord (NC) languages.

Igálà is a language that employs two, at a time, morpho-syntactic negative morphemes which seems to depend on another to express a semantic negation. Our task in this paper is not only to identify the types of negative morpheme(s) attested in Igálà, but also

to determine how Igálà negative expressions are derived and interpreted by means of the syntactic behaviour, scope, and distribution of the negative morphemes³. The paper is organized in four sections: section 2 is a brief sketch of the theoretical framework adopted in our paper; we present Igálà negation facts in section 3; and proceeded

³ *Igálà is an SVO language spoken in North Central Nigeria. Genetically, it belongs to the Yoruboid subgroup of the new Benue-Congo alongside Yorùbá (spoken in south west Nigeria) and Itshẹ̀kiri (spoken in the riverine south-south/Niger-Delta region of Nigeria). See BENDOR-SAMUEL, 1989 and HEINE & DEREK-NURSE, 2000 for further information.

to analyze those facts within the ambit of the adopted theoretical framework in section 4; section 5 is the conclusion where we summarize our findings and their implications.

Theoretical Framework

This study adopts the minimalist program (MP henceforth) as propounded by CHOMSKY (1993, 1995, 1998, 2002) for the analysis of Igala negative clause expressions. MP assumes a lexicon in which every word possesses three universal sets of features: $\langle \text{Sem}, \text{Syn}, \text{Phon} \rangle$ where Sem = semantic; Syn = syntactic, and Phon = phonetic. Every syntactic derivation starts with a numeration $\{\text{LI}, \text{LI}, \dots \text{n}\}$ where words to be used for the derivation are selected directly from the lexicon. Syntactic derivation is achieved from this point by a simple mathematical operation called *merge* which combines words from the numeration or a new word from the numeration with an already formed constituents or syntactic objects (i.e. external merge), and sometimes re-combine constituents within an already formed syntactic object (i.e. internal merge) based on binary principle. MP assumes that human brain has infinite capacity to compute or build structures using operation *merge* both at the level of syntax and morphology, such that an operation of the type Merge $(x, y) = \{x, y\}$, i.e. the product of merge (x, y) is the set of things including x and y . The binary nature of *merge* rules out unary and ternary branching, and equally disallows vacuous projections which violate the Linear Correspondence Axiom (LCA), i.e. SPEC>HEAD>COMP ordering principle and the Inclusiveness Principle which ensure output label of a syntactic derivation is not arbitrarily set but derived from the label of inputs. For instance, the product of merge (α, β) can only be either an α -phrase or β -phrase but not a γ -phrase because γ was not part of the numeration in the first place.

Every derived syntactic object (product of *merge*) is assumed to move towards the interface, i.e. the Sensory Motor Interface (SMI) or PF and Conceptual Intentional (CI) or LF, for Spell-Out. Spell-out is the output of derivation particularly at the level of pronunciation, i.e. Phonetic Form (PF). It applies at some point in the course of derivation to sieve out the phonological elements and map them to PF. Every syntactic derivation must converge at Spell-Out based on compatibility

of features of the words selected for use in the derivation, which must be checked against one another in the process of derivation. In a nutshell, every convergent derivation must be made up of syntactic objects that carry compatible features. Any incompatible feature disrupts structural harmony, blocks convergence, and causes the resultant phrase/clause to crash. In order to ensure compatibility of features carried by lexical items, the computation system checks their features against one another by invoking the features-checking movement operation, which is also called internal merge.

Other MP assumptions are relevant to this paper: (i) split-Infl hypothesis, which assumes independent projection for each of the former Infl constituents in earlier generative grammars, e.g. Government-Binding theory; (ii) VP-internal-subject hypothesis, which assumes subjects of clauses originate within the VP; (iii) and VP-shell analysis, which holds that VPs canonically have a complex structure comprising an inner core VP headed by a lexical verb and an outer VP shell headed by a strong null (\emptyset) light verb to which the lexical V of the inner/core VP adjoins when raised to VP to lexicalize V (CHOMSKY 1995 p.321). The VP-shell analysis equally assumes that some arguments, e.g. agent, originate within the outer VP shell while others like theme originate within the inner/core VP shell.

Igálà Neg Morphemes

Negative morphemes or negators constitute a functional category employed to deny the truth value of a proposition. Neg in this respect converts "... a sentence, S_1 , into another sentence, S_2 , such that S_2 is true whenever S_1 is false, and vice-versa" (DAHL, 1979 p.80). Igálà has two double-particle negative morphemes. The first, generally used in negating declarative/affirmative expressions, consists of a high tone, which is often realized superficially as some kind of tonal modification on the subject, and an obligatory clause-final element, **ń/ńóò**. The second negative item **má...ń/ńóò** is used only in conditional clauses.

Negating Affirmative/Declarative Propositions

The affirmative notion of a declarative proposition in Igálà

appears to be switched off first by the high tone morpheme which attaches to the subject of the sentence and the negation effect is completed by the clause-final particle **ń/nóò**, as illustrated in (3).

- (3ai) Àbíṃṭọ́ á kọ éli
Children prog sing song
'The children are singing.'
- (3aii) Àbíṃṭọ́ á kọ éli **ń/nóò**⁴
Children-neg prog sing song neg
'The children are not singing.'
- (3bi) Ọ̀bàlà nmọ́ ómi
Cat drink water
'The cat drank water.'
- (3bii) Ọ̀bàlà́ nmọ́ ómi **ń/nóò**
Cat-neg drink water not
'The cat did not drink water.'
- (3ci) Àfẹ̀ wẹ̀ chìwà/chàtìtì
Shirt your do-dirt.
'Your shirt is dirty.'
- (3cii) Àfẹ̀ wẹ́ chìwà/chàtìtì **ń/nóò**
Shirt your-neg do-dirt Neg
'Your shirt is not dirty.'
- (3di) Íye Aládi nyú/nyí ájá éjúlẹ̀
Mother Aladi go market éjúlẹ̀
'Aládi's mother went to the ejule market.'
- (3dii) Íye Aladí́ nyú ájá éjúlẹ̀ **ń/nóò**
Mother Aladi-neg go market éjúlẹ̀ Neg
'Aladi's mother did not go to Ejule market.'

The same structural process obtains when pronouns are used as subject. This is evident in (4) where the high-tone negative morpheme overrides the original tone of the immediately preceding subject pronoun.

⁴ This form, **nóò**, appears in emphatic statements. We suspect that the vocalic portion of this form (i.e. -**óò**) is an emphatic clitic similar to Yoruba **oo** in expressions like **orí ì mi oo!** 'my head!' and Igbo **nne m oo!** 'my child!' - cf. OYEBADE, 1988 and AKINLABI & LIBERMAN, 2000 - If this is true, then Igálà clause-final Neg marker is invariably the high-toned syllabic nasal **ń**.

- (4ai) **Ù** jẹ ọjẹ lẹ
1sg eat food the
'I ate the food.'
- (4aii) **Ú** jòjẹ lẹ **ń/nóò**
1sg-neg eat-food the Neg
'I did not eat the food.'
- (4bi) **Ì** che ukóló gbíti
3sg do work hard
'S/he worked hard.'
- (4bii) **Í** chukóló gbíti **ń/nóò**
3sg-neg do-work hard Neg
'S/he did not work hard.'
- (4ci) **À** á kòchè eli
1pl prog learn-work song
'We are learning to sing.'
- (4cii) **Á**⁵ kòchè éli **ń/nóò**
1pl-neg-prog learn-work song Neg
'We are not learning to sing.'

Structural evidence from (3a-d) and (4a-c) show that declarative/affirmative clause negation in Igálà is effected by tonal alternation of the last syllable of the subject (from low or mid-tone to high-tone) and the addition of a high-toned clause-final syllabic nasal. The high-tone Neg morpheme must appear as close to the end of the subject as possible. As a first approximation, it could be argued that the high tone particle is a prosodic suffix which is attached to the subject. That will account for its occurrence as close to the end of the subject as possible. Since it is a prosodic affix with no inherent segmental affiliation, it attaches to the syllable nearest to the right edge of the subject. The problem with this suggestion, however, is that the sense of negation has more immediate implications for the predicate than the subject. In other words, there is a non-isomorphic relationship between the morphological affiliation of this prosodic Neg particle and its syntax. We address this non-isomorphic relationship in the next sub-section.

⁵ This item is a contracted form comprising the 1pl pronoun, **A**, the prosodic high tone Neg, and the progressive aspect, **á**. In other words, (4cii) is phonemically derived from:

A á kòchè eli **ń/nóò**
1sg neg prog learn-work song Neg
'We are not learning to sing.'

Non-Isomorphic Relationship between the Morphology and Syntax of Igálà Prosodic Neg Particle

In the last sub-section, we argued that the high tone Neg particle in Igálà cannot be a suffix although it superficially appears like one. One piece of confirming evidence supporting this position is that of ZWICKY; PULLUM's (1983, p.503) criteria for distinguishing clitics from affixes. They argue that "... clitics exhibit a low degree of selection with respect to their host while affixes exhibit a high degree of selection with respect to their stems." As can be observed from the data (3a-d and 4a-d) the high tone is indifferent to the category of its host (whether noun, pronouns, etc.) as long as it is the final/closest element to the right in the subject. This observation argues for this particle to be considered a clitic where a clitic is an element which "... exhibit(s) an affix-like phonological dependency on a neighbouring word, but whose syntax is word-like."

Turning now to the morphology/syntax mismatch, i.e. the non-isomorphism between the morphology and syntax of the prosodic Neg morpheme in Igálà, we see an analogous auxiliary element with the noun subject in English:

[...] let us consider a simple case of cliticization in English, involving 'd, the reduced form of the auxiliary would(...). From a purely syntactic point of view, 'd is a separate word, on a parallel with the full form would. This consideration would lead us to posit a structure roughly like (3a) for the sentence 'He'd have done it'. From a purely morphological point of view, However, 'd would appear to be attached. This would motivate (3b) as the structure of the sequence he'd from a purely morphological point of view, where the subscript w indicates that the sequence counts as a single morphological word:

(a) [He [VP 'd [VP have [VP done it]]]]

(b) [w he'd]

The situation with 'd is typical of clitics (...). As Saddock notes, clitics are associated with an array of properties, including being morphologically bound morphemes at the same time as being syntactically independent. (Indeed, these two characteristics might be taken as the defining property of clitics...). (SPROAT, 2001, p.337-338)

Although the morphology and syntax of Igálà prosodic Neg particle produces a mismatch, it is a licit construction as it obeys Saddock's cliticization principle:

[...] if a lexeme combines with an inflected word in the

morphology and with a phrase in the syntax, its morphosyntactic association will confirm to at least the Weak Linearity Constraint. (SADDOCK, 1991 p.105)

Saddock gives the Strong and Weak Linearity Constraints as follows:

- (a) Strong: The associated elements of morphological and syntactic representations must occur in the same linear order.
- (b) Weak: The associated elements of morphological and syntactic representations must occur in as close to the same linear order as the morphological requirements of the lexemes allows. (SADDOCK, 1991 p.105)

The prosodic high-tone Neg construction in Igálà obeys the Strong Linearity Constraint as its morphological and syntactic representations occur in the same linear order.

One may wonder why the unassociated tone affiliates with the subject rather than the verb which may potentially provide an anchor for it. We contend that this situation is imposed by the need for the predicate to be circumscribed by the two Neg particles involved in the construction; an affiliation of the tone of the prosodic Neg particle with the vocalic element of the verb will, at best, obscure such a provision.

Negation in Conditional Clauses

This type of negation in Igálà uses the element **má** which appears to be in complementary distribution with the prosodic high-tone Neg morpheme employed in negating simple affirmative/declarative clauses. As evident in (5), not only is the prosodic Neg absent in conditional clause negation, but also the proximity of **má** to the subject in conditional clause negation is similar to that of the prosodic Neg morpheme in declarative clause negation. Apart from this, the two of them cannot co-occur, as evident in (5b).

(5a) Ì **má** gbà **ń/nóò**, ẹ mun du wa
 3sg Neg accept Neg 2pl take-3sg bring come
 'If s/he did not accept (it), you return it here.'

(5b) *Í **má** gbà **ń/nóò**, ẹ mun du wa
 3sg-Neg Neg accept Neg 2pl take-3sg bring come
 'If s/he did not accept (it), you return it here.'

(5c) Ítíchà dúú kì **má** wa **ń**, màá du òfé ma

lúná

teacher all that-3sg Neg come Neg 3pl-fut take buttock
their see-fire

'All teachers that refuse to come; they will make them
experience fire.'

má...ń/nóò as illustrated in (5) is the Neg combination employed for conditional clause negation in Igálà. However, the two negative markers must be present in the first half of the conditional clause before the negative interpretation can be induced in such expression.

Constituent Negation

Constituent negation in Igálà is tricky. The language does not appear to have structures in which nouns or nominal constituents are directly negated, at least in isolation. When a nominal constituent is to be negated in Igálà, a negative cleft clause construction in which the constituent to be negated shows up as the direct object of the copula **che** is obligatorily created. In the process, the nominal constituent bears some kind of negative emphasis in the newly constructed Neg clause. This is evident in (6b).

- (6a) Òmì dẹ
1sg be
'It is me.'
- (6b) í che òmì **ń/nóò**
3sg-neg be 1sg Neg
'It is not me.'
- (6c) *ò mí dẹ **ń/nóò**
1sg-Neg be Neg
'It is not me.'

In (6b), the negated nominal constituent, **ò mí** '1sg', the subject of another copula, **dẹ**, in (6a), becomes the direct object of **che**. The expletive ì '3sg' immediately followed by the prosodic Neg morpheme which overrides its tone to make it í shows up as the subject, and **ń/nóò** completes the construction clause-finally just as it does in negated affirmative clauses. (6c) is a bad negative form of (6a) because the

obligatory negative cleft construction is not projected there.

This same pattern is observable in constituent negation of quantifiers. In Igálà, quantifiers cannot be directly negated. They have to be merged in a regular affirmative negative clause or a negative cleft clause of the type in (6b). That is part of the reasons why negative expressions like (7ai-ci) are bad in Igálà while their counterparts in (7ai-ci) are convergent.

(7ai) *Énẹ dúú ń Person all Neg 'Nobody'	(7aii) Í che [Énẹ dúú] ń 3sg be person all Neg 'It is nobody.'
(7bi) *Énwu dúú ń Thing all Neg 'Nothing'	(7bii) Í che [Énwu dúú] ń 3sg be thing all Neg 'It is nothing.'
(7ci) *Úgbò dúú ń Place all Neg 'Nowhere'	(7cii) Í che [Úgbò dúú] ń 3sg be place all Neg 'It is nowhere.'

The same structural pattern is evident in (8): It is only in (8b) where the prosodic Neg morpheme and **ń** are combined that the negative interpretation is licit. (8c) crashes because the prosodic high tone Neg is absent there.

- (8a) **Ù** la [énwu dúú]
1sg buy thing every
'I bought everything.'
- (8b) **Ú** la [énwu dúú] **ń**
1sg buy thing every Neg
'I bought nothing.'
- (8c) ***Ù** la *[enwu dúú **ń**]
1sg buy thing every Neg
'I bought nothing'.

The ill-formedness noted in (7) and (8c) shows that **ń**, as used in (7ai-ci), is not a structural part of the quantifier phrase but part of a larger negative clause construction jointly projected by it and the prosodic high-tone Neg.

The implication of this observation is that the scope of negation

in this type of construction is not directly on the nominal constituent but on the clause where the constituent shows up. This fact is much more evident in complex negative clause constructions of the type in (9b-d) where negation obligatorily interacts with topicalization. In other words, any constituent to be negated in (9a) has to raise to the left periphery of (9a) where it superficially appears like the direct complement of the copula **che**. However, the direct complement of **che** in this type of construction is a CP, a Topic Phrase to be precise. It is the agent subject **Achilẹ** in (9b), theme object **ùkpò íye un** 'his mother's cloth' in (9c), and the predicate **gwẹ** 'wash' in (9c).

- (9a) Achilẹ gwẹ ùkpò íye un
 Achile wash cloth mother his
 'Achile washed his mothers clothes.'
- (9b) **Í** che Achilẹ [gwẹ ùkpò íye un] **ń**
 3sg be Achile wash cloth mother his Neg
 'It is not Achile that washed his mother's clothes.'
- (9c) **Í** che ùkpò íye un [Achilẹ gwẹ] **ń**
 3sg be cloth mother his Achile wash Neg
 'It is not his mothers clothes Achile washed.'
- (9d) **Í** che égwẹ [Achilẹ gwẹ ùkpò íye un] **ń**
 3sg be washing Achile wash cloth mother his Neg
 'It is not that Achile WASHED his mothers clothes.'

Syntactic Derivation of Igálà Neg Expressions

So far we have identified three negative morphemes in Igálà, namely the prosodic high-tone employed in declarative clause and constituent negation; **má** employed in conditional clause negation; and **ń/nóò** which is obligatory in all forms of negative expressions in the language. In this section, we shall attempt a syntactic characterization of the derivation of Igálà negative clause constructions in relation to the interaction of the Neg morphemes involved in such derivation.

Interaction of Neg Morphemes

Beginning with the status of Igálà in respect of negation, the fact

that every Igálà negative clause construction requires a clause-internal combination of two Neg morphemes to be convergent, each of which cannot independently induce a semantic negation, suggests Igálà is a Negative Concord (NC) language. Since we already know that, at least, two Neg morphemes must interact to derive a semantic negation in Igálà, the next step is to find out the nature of that interaction. Two views can be considered in this respect:

First, one can consider the prosodic high tone Neg or **má** as the head that projects Igálà negative constructions. This is not unconnected with the fact that they show up in Infl position and occur first in the linear order of constituents found in Igálà negative constructions unlike **ń/nóò** which consistently occurs clause-finally. Looking at the linear position of **ń/nóò** in the light of this view, one might be tempted to analyze it as some kind of post-verbal adverb since adverbs regularly occur as post-V modifiers in Igálà. However, since adverbs are adjuncts, such consideration will yield wrong predictions as it would deny the fact that **ń/nóò** is obligatory in every Igálà negative construction. In other words, **ń/nóò** cannot be an adjunct and at the same time be obligatory in Igálà negative clause expressions.


The second view is to assume **ń/nóò** as the core Neg head that drives the derivation of negative expressions in Igálà. The reason for this is not far fetched: **má** and the prosodic Neg cannot do without **ń/nóò** but, on the other hand, **ń/nóò** can do without either of them by simply selecting one over the other for the derivation of the two types of negative constructions attested in the language. For instance, it selects the prosodic Neg to derive affirmative clause negation, but goes for **má** when it is conditional clause negation. As a matter of fact, this latter view is the one assumed in this paper. We discuss how these Neg morphemes combine to project NegP in the following subsection.

Neg Projections


We assume each of the Neg morphemes identified in Igálà projects a separate NegP. We further assume that the projection of the prosodic Neg and **má** are in some kind of complementary distribution such that when you have one, the other would be absent. In line with the VP shell analysis, ILQRI, (2010, p.233-235) proposed that the

projection of **ń** is situated in-between the outer vP shell and the inner core VP within the verb phrase, i.e. in a position lower than that of the prosodic morpheme and **má**. In the analysis, the inner core VP is the direct complement of **ń** while both the lexical V and its object are forced to raise across it to check their accusative features thereby leaving **ń** behind as the superficial clause-final element at spell-out. This grammar sketched out in (10a) is illustrated in (10b).

(10a)




(10b)



However, as compelling as this analysis appears, it does not account for the fact that nothing occurs after **ń/nóò** in the Igálà negative clause constructions. For instance, nothing stops an adverb from following **ń/nóò** in structures like (10), but that would not be a convergent derivation for Igálà native speakers. It also does not reflect the fact that **ń/nóò** is the core Neg morpheme that scopes over the projection of **má** and that of the prosodic Neg morpheme as earlier noted in 4.1.

Therefore, contra ILQRI (2010), we propose that Igálà has a unified but complex Neg clause syntax in which two Neg projections are concatenated. The maximal projection of the prosodic Neg morpheme or **má** which we shall call NegP1 is directly merged, as complement, to Neg⁰ **ń/nóò** to derive NegP2. NegP1 is subsequently raised to spec-NegP2 to derive the surface string where **ń/nóò** obligatory and constantly occurs clause-finally in Igálà Neg clauses. This process is a kind of NegP raising triggered by the need to check off the specifier feature of the head of NegP2, **ń**, which appears to be asking for a NegP1 type to relate with before its projection can converge. This proposed grammar, as sketched out in (11), takes care of both the declarative/affirmative clause negation and the conditional clause negation associated with **má** in Igálà.

(11)



This grammar also predicts that no other item(s), not even adverbs, can occur after the clause final Neg morpheme in Igálà negative clause constructions. The internal structure of NegP1 is such that Neg⁰1 merges with a VP complement from where the subject of the intended clause is attracted to spec-NegP1 to check off the EPP feature of the Neg head.

Conclusion

We have examined the expressions of negation in Igálà. We conclude that Igálà is a Negative Concord (NC) language since it is obligatory for every negative clause in the language to contain at least two negative morphemes which must interact to generate a single semantic negation. We argued that each of the Igálà Neg morphemes projects independent Neg phrases in Infl which are structurally mapped and ordered by scope relationship such that **ń/nóò** c-commands and takes either the projection of the prosodic high-tone Neg or **má** as complement and subsequently attracts it to its specifier position to check off its spec features. This does not only explain why. We also noted that it is only when the clause final Neg morpheme **ń** becomes stressed that its **nóò** form is used.

References

- ABOH, E. O. **The Morphosyntax of Complement-Head Sequences**: Clause Structure and Word Order Patterns in Kwa. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- AKINLABI, Akinbiyi; LIBERMAN, M. The Tonal Phonology of Yoruba Clitics, GERLACH, B.; GRIJZENHOUT, J. eds. **Clitics in Phonology, Morphology and Syntax**. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, p.31-62, 2000.
- BAKER, M. **Incorporation**. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.
- BENDOR-SAMUEL, J. ed. **The Niger-Congo Languages**. Lanham: University Press of America, 1989.
- BIBERAUER, T.; ZEIJLSTRA, Hedde. Negative Concord in Afrikaans: Filling the Typological Gap. <http://ling.auf.net/lingBuzz/00647>, 2009.
- CHOMSKY, N. A Minimalist Program for Linguistic Theory, HALE, Kenneth; KEYSER, Samuel eds. **View from Building 20**: Essays in Linguistics in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger, p. 1-52, 1993.
- CHOMSKY, N. **The Minimalist Program**. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1995.
- _____. The Minimalist Inquiries: the Framework, **MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics**, No 15, 1998.
- _____. **On Nature and Language**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

COLLINS, C. **Introduction to Minimalist Syntax**, African Linguistics School Hand-out, Porto-Novo, Benin, 2011.

DAHL, O. **Typology of Sentence Negation**, Linguistics, 17 p. 79-106, 1979.

HAEGEMAN, L. **The Syntax of Negation**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

HEINE, Bernd; NURSE, Derek eds. 2000. **African Languages**: An Introduction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

ILORI, J. F. **Nominal Constructions in Igálà and Yorùbá**. 2010. (Doctoral Dissertation) - Adekunle Ajasin University Akungba-Akoko Ondo State, Nigeria, 2010.

OYEBADE, F. O. **Issues in the Phonology of Kakanda Language**: an Autosegmental Perspective. 1988. (Doctoral Dissertation) - University of Ilorin, Ilorin Nigeria, 1988.

RADFORD, A. **English Syntax**: An Introduction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

SADOCK, Jerrold. **Autolexical Syntax**: A Theory of Parallel Grammatical Representations. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1991.

SPROAT, R. Morphology as Component or Module: Mapping Principle Approaches, Spencer, A. & A.M. Zwicky eds. **The Handbook of Morphology**. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, p.335-348, 2001.

STUMP, G. T. Inflection, Spencer, A. & A.M. Zwicky eds. **The Handbook of Morphology**. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, p.13-43, 2001.

ZEIJLSTRA, Hedde. On French Negation, <http://ling.auf.net/lingBuzz/00645>, 2009.

ZWICKY, Arnold; PULLUM, Georey. Phonology in syntax: the Somali optional agreement rule. **Natural Language & Linguistic Theory** 1, p.385-402, 1983.

YIP, Moira. **Tone**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Recebido em 01 de dezembro de 2011.

Aceito em 19 de março de 2012.